

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 3 and 8, and leave claims 4 and 5 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 3-5 and 8.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting the interview conducted on October 9, 2007. In the interview, Applicants' representative brought to the Examiner's attention a typographical error of the identified prior art recited in the Office Action. The Examiner indicated that the correct prior art is U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0198752 to Stiffler, rather than U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0014273 to Seki (i.e., the published application of the present invention). In this response, Applicants have addressed the Examiner's request to consider the newly found prior art, where the newly found prior art is the Stiffler reference, rather than the Seki reference.

Claim for Foreign Priority (3rd Request)

Applicants filed a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119, claiming the right for priority based on Japanese Patent Application No. 2001-212365. The certified copy of the priority document was filed on March 11, 2002, and a review of Public PAIR indicates that the Office has received the document (see page 2 of "Certified Copy of Foreign Priority Application," with a mail room date of March 11, 2002). However, although the Examiner acknowledged Applicants' claim for foreign priority (see item 12 of the Office Action Summary mailed on July 5, 2006), the Examiner incorrectly indicated that the certified copy of the priority document has not been received. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's

acknowledgement of receipt of the certified copy of the priority document, by checking boxes 12(a)(1) on the Office Action Summary.

Positively Claiming the Invention

The Examiner indicated that Applicants have not positively claimed the invention that Applicants regard as the claimed invention. Applicants have amended claims 3 and 8 to positively claim the invention. Therefore, claims 3 and 8 are allowable.

Consideration of Newly Found Art

The Examiner indicated that during the search of an unrelated application, the Examiner found a reference (Stiffler), which the Examiner deemed as being valid prior art to cite against the pending claims in the present application. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Applicants submit that Stiffler does not teach or suggest all the features of the present invention.

For example, Stiffler does not teach or suggest "preparing the application documents for said user selected country to comply with an application format and examination conditions in said user selected country such that none of said application documents include any item violating said examination criteria including a quantity of a component in the application documents" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 8.

If the Examiner persists in the assertion that Stiffler teaches or suggests features of the present invention, the Examiner is respectfully invited to provide a rejection of the claims, where appropriate. In this way, Applicants will be on notice as to the specific reasons the Examiner believes Stiffler teaches or suggests the present invention.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 3-5 and 8 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 3-5 and 8 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing Attorney Docket No. 500.41210X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.


Donna K. Mason
Donna K. Mason
Registration No. 45,962

DKM/cmd
(703) 684-1120